DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 354 566 CS 508 080

AUTHOR McPherson, Mary B.; Kearney, Patricia
TITLE Classroom Embarrassment: Types, Goals, and Face Saving Strategies.
PUB DATE Oct 92
NOTE 45p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (78th, Chicago, IL, October 29-November 1, 1992).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Classroom Communication; *Classroom Environment; Communication Research; Higher Education; *Student Reaction; *Teacher Behavior; *Teacher Student Relationship; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS Communication Behavior; *Communication Strategies; *Embarrassment

ABSTRACT

A study verified and extended the utility of three topologies of embarrassment (types of embarrassment, face saving strategies, and goals of embarrassment) to the college classroom context. Subjects, 209 undergraduate students enrolled in 12 introductory, lower-division, interpersonal communication classes at a large western United States university, were asked to describe an incident in which they were significantly embarrassed by a teacher in college, what they said or did to reduce their embarrassment, and why they think the teacher embarrassed them. Responses were reliably coded into caregories using the three topologies of embarrassment. The applicability of the categories in the classroom context were verified; however, the topologies were extended to incorporate unique classroom situations. Findings suggest that embarrassment in the college classroom differs somewhat from other contexts. Ongoing research is examining students' perceptions of teachers who use embarrassment either to gain students' compliance, or with the aim of rewarding them with recognition or praise, or through labeling or discounting students' ideas, or in some other way, either intentional or unintentional. (Three tables presenting revised topologies and three tables of data are included; contains 23 references.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED354566

Classroom Embarrassment: Types, Goals, and Face Saving Strategies

Mary B. McPherson

Ohio University

Patricia Kearney

California State University, Long Beach

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Mary B. McPherson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Running head: CLASSROOM EMBARRASSMENT

Paper submitted to the Instructional Development Division of the Speech Communication Association.

Mary B. McPherson (MA, California State University, Long Beach) is a Doctoral student at Ohio University and Patricia Kearney (Ed.D., West Virginia University, 1979) is a Professor in the Department of Speech Communication at California State University, Long Beach, Long Beach, CA 90840-2407.

Portions of the data in this paper were presented on an invited panel at the Western States Communication Association convention, Boise, ID, February, 1992.

CS508080

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

Researchers have developed comprehensive taxonomies to explain embarrassing predicaments in interpersonal and organizational contexts. This study verifies and extends the utility of three typologies of embarrassment (types of embarrassment, face saving strategies, and goals of embarrassment) to the college classroom context. Students (N=209) were asked to describe an incident in which they were significantly embarrassed by a teacher in college, what they said or did to reduce their embarrassment, and why they think the teacher embarrassed them. Responses were reliably coded into categories using three typologies of embarrassment. The applicability of the categories in the classroom context were verified; however, the typologies were extended to incorporate unique classroom situations. Implications, limitations, and directions for future research are discussed.

Students' Perceptions of Teacher-Initiated Embarrassment in the College Classroom

Most of us, at one time or another, have been in an embarrassing predicament that caused us distress and chagrin. Since embarrassment is often socially disruptive, an individual's ability to cope with embarrassing predicaments is considered an important skill for smooth social interaction (Cupach & Metts, 1990a; 1990b; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Cupach, Metts, & Hazleton, 1986). Although embarrassment and face saving strategies have been studied in a variety of social contexts, little research has been conducted in the realm of the classroom. In fact, embarrassment is one of the least studied experiences in the school (Martin, 1987). Ironically, most of us can and do recall the classroom experience as a rich but painful source for many embarrassing predicaments. This investigation examines teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom and its effects on students.

Determining the causes and consequences of student embarrassment can be an important step in the process of understanding teacher-student interactions. The general focus of this study is to explore teacher-initiated embarrassment in college classrooms. Specifically, the types of embarrassment that teachers provoke in the classroom, the face saving strategies used by embarrassed students, and student-perceived teacher goals of embarrassment are examined.

Embarrassment

Definitions of embarrassment vary, but most definitions recognize an incongruity between the actual and a desired public image. For instance, Goffman (1956) writes that embarrassment is an uncomfortable feeling that may occur as a result of a deviation from one's normal state. Gross and Stone (1964, p.2) maintain that "embarrassment occurs whenever some central

assumption in a transaction has been unexpectedly violated for at least one participant." Similarly, Edelmann (1987) states that embarrassment occurs when we fail to present a desired image to others who evaluate our performance.

Embarrassment reflects a failure in one's self-presentation to others. The individual experiences a loss of self-esteem due to his/her perceived loss of public esteem. "Embarrassment is a feeling of concern with one's public image and with the reactions from real or imagined others. Embarrassment then is the negative consequence of a failure to present a desired image to others whom we regard as evaluating our performance" (Edelmann, 1987, p. 869). In the classroom context, teachers are role-defined as evaluators of student performance; peers provide a natural "audience" for student behaviors as well. Thus, both teachers and peers can, and often do, contribute to student embarrassment. Consequently, student embarrassment can be defined as feelings of discomfort or humiliation that occur as a result of a student's failure to present a desired image to his/her peers and/or teachers.

Types of embarrassment

In researchers' attempts to further define embarrassment, typologies or categories of embarrassment were derived. Initially, Gross and Stone (1964) identified three categories of embarrassment: 1) inappropriate identity, 2) loss of poise, and 3) disturbance of the assumptions persons make about one another in social transactions. Later, Sattler (1965) developed an extremely detailed category schema (39 categories) from subjects' descriptions of embarrassing situations. Weinberg (1968) provided an alternative typology by identifying two underlying dimensions of embarrassment: 1) intentionality of the act and 2) correctness of definition.

Interpersonal communication researchers have relied heavily on the Weinberg typology (Metts & Cupach, 1989) or the Sattler categories (Sharkey & Stafford, 1990) to identify types of embarrassment. However, Metts and Cupach (1989) maintain that current typologies fail to provide an exhaustive, theoretical scheme. They argue that most of these attempts to categorize embarrassment have been overly simplistic or incomplete.

In an attempt to convey a clearer picture of embarrassing situations, Cupach and Metts (1990a) proposed a comprehensive taxonomy of types of embarrassment grounded in respondents' self reports of embarrassing interpersonal events. In addition, this taxonomy identifies who is responsible for the embarrassment. The taxonomy begins with two primary classifications of embarrassment: Actor Responsible and Observer Responsible.

Contained within Actor Responsible are three classes of embarrassment: Idealized Social Actor, Accomplished Role Performer, and Idealized Self Image. There are two types of Idealized Social Actor: Rule Violation (rule known and rule unknown) and Comportment (loss of physical, emotional, or environmental control). Accomplished Role Performer, the second class of Actor Responsible situations identified by Cupach and Metts (1990a), includes two subcategories: abilities/skills and responsibilities/obligations. Cupach and Metts (1990a) label the third class of Actor Responsible embarrassment as Idealized Self-Image. Idealized Self-Image can be divided into two types of embarrassment depending upon whether the behavior has created a false image or threatened an established one.

Cupach and Metts (1990a) divided the second primary classification of embarrassment, Observer Responsible, into two classes of embarrassment:

Direct Involvement and Indirect Involvement. The two types of situations incorporated within Direct Involvement include individualization and causing to look unpoised. Individualization may involve one of three forms of attention: recognition/praise, criticism/correction, and teasing. Embarrassment through indirect involvement may occur in one of three ways: association, empathic embarrassment, and privacy violation.

Cupach and Metts' (1990a) findings support the usefulness and validity of their proposed taxonomy. All instances described by the respondents were reliably sorted into their respective categories. These categories might be expected to generalize to types of embarrassment that occur in the college classroom. However, the college classroom provides a unique, evaluative environment in which a number of other embarrassing predicaments might occur.

Unlike interpersonal relationships, instructor evaluation is extended beyond social or personal assessments to include evaluations of learning, skills, and motivation. In essence, the classroom provides an opportunity for an embarrassed actor (student) to be observed by a generally large number of peers as well as the instructor who <u>all</u> evaluate the embarrassed person in some way. This environment may generate very different categories of embarrassment than previous studies in the interpersonal context.

<u>Face saving strategies</u>

Oftentimes, embarrassment is an uncomfortable and negative experience, a situation which most people tend to avoid whenever possible. If embarrassment does transpire, the embarrassed individual may attempt to regain or recover his/her appropriate and former image. Through the use of various tactics and social skills one may diminish the embarrassment in order to regain "face".

Goffman (1955, p.213) defines the term "face" as "the image of self portrayed in terms of approved social attributes." "To lose face" means to present an image that is not internally consistent. "To save face," sometimes called face-work, is the process by which a person sustains an impression for others that he/she has not lost face (Goffman, 1955; 1967).

Many researchers agree that people do engage in face saving strategies and that face saving is an important part in the maintenance of one's public image (Goffman, 1956; Modigliani, 1971; Edelmann, 1985). Based on this consensus, recent researchers have been concerned with types and effects of face saving strategies used in various embarrassing situations (Cupach & Metts, 1990a, 1990b; Cupach, Metts, & Hazleton, 1986; Metts & Cupach, 1989; Sharkey & Stafford, 1990).

Typologies of face saving strategies have been based on the facework literature by Goffman (1955, 1956, 1967, 1971) and Modigliani (1971). This literature suggests four classes of face saving strategies: apologies, accounts, avoidance, and humor. Recently, Cupach and Metts (1990a, 1990b) developed a typology of face-saving strategies based on a series of studies using respondent-generated face saving tactics along with the four original classes or face saving (Cupach, Metts & Hazleton, 1986: Metts & Cupach, 1989). Using respondent-generated examples, nine categories emerged: apologies, account, humor, remediation, escape, avoidance, aggression, apology plus, and remediation plus.

Other researchers have investigated face saving strategies that have resulted in similar typologies. Sharkey and Waldron's (1990) investigation of intentional embarrassment in organizations revealed overlapping face saving strategies. Subsequently, Sharkey and Stafford (1990) used a slightly modified version of Cupach and Metts' typology. Again, their results indicated

overlapping typologies with Cupach and Metts' work, thus verifying the utility of their classification scheme.

Because of the desire to appear socially competent, embarrassed persons often use strategies to regain composure and order in the interactions (Goffman, 1956). Face saving research looks at the strategies people use to gain composure in order to counterbalance disruptive interactions. In the classroom context, face-saving may be an important tool in reducing students' feelings of anxiety, deficiency and shame. However, strategies used by students in the classroom may differ from strategies people use in other contexts. Not only is the embarrassed student usually observed by a group of peers and an instructor, but the student is also forced to encounter these same observers again and again throughout an entire semester or school career. Saving face, then, may have both immediate and long-term consequences. Currently, no studies have investigated students' use of face-saving strategies in the classroom.

Goals of embarrassment

In order to accomplish a goal, many times we plan specific strategies. Depending on a person's goal, one strategy of attaining that goal may be to embarrass another person. In the classroom, one goal of many teachers is to gain compliance from their students. A strategy teachers may use to encourage students to arrive to class on time, for example, may be to embarrass students who arrive late. This strategy may be a sufficient way to attain compliance.

Similar to the many categories of embarrassment, researchers have constructed typologies for goals of embarrassment. According to Gross and Stone (1964), there are three reasons or functions for deliberate embarrassment: 1) socialize people into a group or organization/ school

individuals in skills to maintain poise; 2) negatively sanction inappropriate behavior; 3) establish and maintain power.

Later, Sharkey and Waldron (1990) modified Gross and Stone's (1964) original typology to identify the goals of intentional embarrassment in the organizational context. Their results support and extend Gross and Stone's (1964) original typology. Sharkey and Waldron (1990) validated the three modified original categories (Show Solidarity, Negative Sanctioning, and Establish Power), and extended the typology to include two additional categories (Discredit and Self-satisfaction). Sharkey (1991) further strengthened the existing typology by investigating individual's goals of embarrassment in the interpersonal context. Once again, the same five categories emerged.

Supplement to categorizing goals of embarrassment, researchers have hypothesized what role embarrassment plays in attempting to accomplish a goal. Most researchers maintain that embarrassment is a tactic of deliberate or intentional embarrassment (Gross & Stone, 1964; Petronio & Snider, 1990; Sharkey & Waldron, 1990; Sharkey, 1991). So far, researchers have studied goals of embarrassment in organizational and interpersonal contexts almost exclusively in terms of intentional embarrassment. Because the college classroom is a unique evaluative environment, students may attribute reasons for teacher-initiated embarrassment differently than in the organizational or interpersonal contexts.

Embarrassment in the classroom

Teacher-initiated embarrassment is one of the most frequently occurring phenomena in the college classroom. In fact, recent evidence indicates that student perceived teacher-initiated embarrassment is one of the most frequently occurring teacher misbehaviors (Kearney, Plax, Hays, & Ivey,

1991). Even so, this phenomena has not received much attention in the instructional arena. Students claim that teachers' lack of understanding and patience, uncaring attitudes, giving favors and holding grudges, treating students as children, interference in students' private matters, and egotism are all potential causes for student embarrassment (Martin, 1987). For many teachers, embarrassing students may be a way to control and manage the classroom.

So far, only one study has examined teacher-initiated embarrassment. Martin (1987) investigated embarrassing predicaments in the high school classroom as part of a larger study of the schooling experience. Many of the respondent-generated causes of student embarrassment reported by Martin (1987), involve teacher-initiated embarrassment. The students identified uncaring teachers who tease or make fun of students as one source of potential embarrassment. For example, Martin (1987) indicated that high school students think they should be treated as adults. Therefore, when a teacher treats a student as a child in front of her/his peers, this may cause significant embarrassment. Also, students are often embarrassed by teachers who "have to be right" (Martin, 1987). Students perceive these teachers to think they are better than the students. As a result of fear and discouragement created by embarrassment, student learning may be disrupted.

According to Martin (1987), students may develop a negative self-concept if teachers embarrass them for asking "dumb" questions. Students also suggested that they cannot concentrate because of the fear of being embarrassed for asking questions or giving wrong answers (Martin, 1987). In some conditions, if a student cannot concentrate or fears asking the teacher for help and clarification when having difficulty understanding class

material, she/he may ultimately receive failing grades or become so discouraged that she/he quits school (Martin,1987).

By revealing the important role embarrassment plays in the classroom, Martin's (1987) investigation provides us with a first step. However, no studies have specifically asked students to identify instances or types of classroom embarrassment. The purpose of this study is to examine embarrassing predicaments in the college classroom, student perceived goals of teacher-initiated embarrassment, and face-saving strategies used by students in their attempts to recover from the embarrassment. Thus, we asked the following questions:

RQ1: To what extent does Cupach and Metts' (1990a) typology of embarrassing situations generalize to teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom context?

RQ2: To what extent does the Cupach and Metts' (1990a) face saving typology generalize to teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom context?

RQ3: To what extent does Sharkey's (1991) typology of goals of embarrassment generalize to the college classroom?

Method

Participants

Participants were 209 (92 males, 117 females) undergraduate students enrolled in 12 introductory, lower-division, interpersonal communication classes at a large Western university. The participants represented all class levels (77 freshmen, 55 sophomores, 43 juniors, and 34 seniors). The particular communication course sampled serves as a general education requirement across the university. Therefore, students represented a

diversity of major fields. Participation was voluntary and respondents were assured of anonymity.

Procedures

After questionnaires were distributed, instructions were delivered orally in class and were also included on the written questionnaire. Students were asked to recall an incident in which they were significantly embarrassed by a teacher in college. Initially, students were encouraged to share their situations with the class to help trigger events for those students who had trouble recalling an embarrassing situation.

First, the students described the embarrassing event. Following the description of the event, students were asked to record the reasons why they thought that particular teacher embarrassed them. A third open-ended question asked students to describe what they said or did in their efforts to cope with the embarrassment. After all students completed the questionnaire, the researcher gave a short summary of the embarrassment research and its application to the college classroom.

Measuring Instruments

Types of embarrassing situations. In order to anchor students' responses to a particular embarrassing situation in the college classroom, students were asked to "think of a specific incident in which YOU were SIGNIFICANTLY EMBARRASSED by a teacher in college." They were then asked to indicate their class standing at the time of the event as well as the teacher's gender. Finally students were asked to "describe the embarrassing event."

A trained coder and the researcher adapted the typology of types of embarrassing situations reported by Cupach and Metts (1990a) to classify each participant's description of the embarrassing events into one of seven

categories of observer responsible (i.e., teacher-initiated) embarrassment. These categories used for coding types of embarrassment included: 1) recognition/praise, 2) criticism/correction, 3) teasing, 4) cause to look unpoised, 5) association, 6) empathic, or 7) privacy violation.

Face saving strategies. In order to assess face-saving behavior, respondents were asked to "describe as specifically as possible what you said or did (if anything) to try to cope with the embarrassing situation." Face-saving strategies were similarly coded using the category scheme presented by Cupach and Metts (1990a). Here, each participant's description was coded into one of nine categories. These categories included: 1)apologies, 2) accounts, 3) humor, 4) remediation, 5) avoidance, 6) escape, 7) aggression, 8) apology plus, or 9) remediation plus.

Goals of embarrassment. Next, students were asked to indicate their perceptions of why that particular teacher embarrassed them. The data were content analyzed for goal-type using Sharkey's (1991) typology. Again, each participant's description was classified into one of five categories of perceived teacher goals for the embarrassment. These five categories included: 1) show solidarity, 2) negative sanctioning, 3) establish power, 4) discredit, or 5) self satisfaction.

In order to assess reliability and validity of each of the three separate coding classification schemes, another coder independently classified a random selection of 20 percent of the respondents' descriptions. Intercoder agreement for embarrassment types was 90%; for face saving strategies, 92%; and for goal types, 90%. Disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Results

Embarrassment Types

The first research question addressed the extent to which the Cupach and Metts' (1990a) typology of embarrassing situations generalize to teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom context. Our results indicate that all seven of the Observer Responsible categories did appear, to some extent, in the classroom context. Many of the categories were subdivided to incorporate unique classroom situations. Unexpectedly, several Actor Responsible categories were also referenced. In this study, however, these categories were redefined as teacher (Observer), not student (Actor), caused. What follows are the results of that revision and analysis.

Table 1 provides the resulting typology of embarrassing situations with relevant definitions and classroom examples. Table 2 references the frequencies and percentages obtained for each category. From the seven Observer Responsible categories presented by Cupach and Metts (1990a), the most frequently occurring type of embarrassment in the classroom was Teacher Recognition/Praise (n=25). This category accounted for 12% of the total sample of embarrassment types (overall N = 209). Recognition/Praise was further divided into three subcategories: 1) Praise (n=11, 5%; teacher announces good grades), 2) Physical Recognition (n=4, 2%; teacher comments on students' physical appearance), and 3) Solicit Involvement (n= 10, 5%; teacher asks student to participate in an activity or answer a question).

Insert Tables 1 & 2 about here

Cupach and Metts' (1990a) category, Teasing, was also found to exist in the college classroom (n=10, 5% of the total). In addition, many students reported Sarcasm as a source of embarrassment (n=9, 4% of the total). Teasing (joking), together with Sarcasm (cutting remarks), made up the second largest Observer Responsible type of embarrassment consisting of 9% (n=19) of the total responses.

The third largest Observer Responsible category was Correction/Criticism (n=18). Correction/Criticism, accounting for 9% of the total responses, was comprised of two subcategories: 1) teacher Corrects student during a performance or task (n=6, 3%), and 2) teacher Publicly Criticizes student's finished work (n=12, 6%). Although the remaining four categories, Cause to Look Unpoised (n=7, 3%), Association (n=2, 1%), Empathic (n=3, 1%), and Privacy Violation (n=1, 0.5%), did emerge in the classroom, these categories made up only a small portion of the types of embarrassment referenced by this sample. Together, these last four categories only comprised 6% of the total.

In addition to the seven Observer Responsible categories found in the classroom, four Actor Responsible categories also emerged: Rule Violation, Threaten Image, Abilities/Skills, and Responsibilities/Obligation. Although these categories are classified as Actor (Student) Responsible in the Cupach and Metts' (1990a) typology, here, the attention drawn to the student by the teacher or an action by the teacher was the impetus for embarrassment.

Rule Violation was the largest of these categories (n=55). In fact, 26% of the respondents reported some type of rule violation as a source of embarrassment in the classroom. However, the embarrassment seemed to arise not from the act of violating a classroom rule, but by being caught in a rule violation and having the teacher draw attention to that violation. Rule

violations could be divided into four types: 1) Tardiness (n=14, 7%), 2) Talking during a lecture (n=18, 9%), 3) Inattentiveness /Daydreaming (n=13, 6%), and 4) Miscellaneous/Idiosyncratic rule violations (n=10, 5%).

The next largest type of embarrassment, comprising 22% of the responses, was Threaten Image (n=46). This category is similar to Cupach and Metts' (1990a) Idealized Self-Image category. In the interpersonal context, Idealized Self-Image involves one's own behavior that is incongruent with one's identity either by creating a false image or threatening an established one. For the classroom, however, students were embarrassed by a teacher presenting an image of the student that was incongruent to that student's image as a person or student.

Our coding revealed that teachers threaten students' images in several ways: 1) Accusations (n=12, 6%; teacher accuses student of wrong-doing), 2) Labels (n=11, 5%; teacher calls student a name or stereotypes student), 3) Inadequacy (n=6, 3%; teacher makes student feel like he/she has asked a dumb question or does not belong in the class), 4) Discount Ideas (n=12, 6%; teacher discounts student's ideas, feelings, or perceptions), and 5) Negative Recognition (n=5, 2%; teacher announces a bad grade or performance). Cupach and Metts (1990a) subdivided Idealized Self-Image into two subcategories: Create False Image and Threaten Established Image.

In this study, Create False Image and Threaten Establish Image were collapsed into one category (Threaten Image) with new subcategories (Accusations, Labels, Inadequacy, Discount Ideas, and Negative Recognition). Threaten Image and the corresponding subcategories better describes classroom embarrassment. For instance, a teacher who accuses, labels, makes a student feel inadequate, discounts students' ideas, or gives negative

recognition may be either creating a false image of the student or threatening an established one.

The next type of embarrassment was adapted to the classroom context from the Cupach and Metts' (1990a) categories: Abilities/Skills and Responsibilities/Obligations. In the classroom, embarrassment resulting from Abilities/Skills was due to students' inability to answer questions because they lacked essential knowledge (n=18, 9%). Embarrassment from Responsibilities/Obligation resulted from students not being properly prepared for class (n=7, 3%). The remaining 5 descriptions (3%) of embarrassment were categorized under Miscellaneous due to the anomalous nature of the embarrassment. The only category presented by Cupach and Metts (1990a) which did not appear in the college classroom was Comportment or loss of physical, emotional, or environmental control.

In overview, both Cupach and Metts' (1990a) investigation and the present study found Indirect Embarrassment (Association, Empathic, and Privacy Violation) to be the smallest of all categories (4% reported by Cupach and Metts; 2.5% obtained in this study). Furthermore, the remainder of Observer Responsible categories (Individualization and Cause to Look Unpoised) accounted for 22% of the total in Cupach and Metts' (1990a) investigation and 27% in the present investigation. However, Individualization in the interpersonal context only comprised 13% of the total while Individualization accounts for 24% of all embarrassment types in the college classroom.

In the present study, students did not identify Comportment as a type of embarrassment in the college classroom. In contrast, Cupach and Metts (1990a) found Comportment to be the largest of all categories in the interpersonal context. Additionally, Rule Violation was the largest category

of embarrassment type in the college classroom (26%); whereas, this category only comprised 12% of the total in the interpersonal context.

Overall then, the original category scheme presented by Cupach and Metts (1990a) did generalize, somewhat, to the college classroom. Although a number of the categories were similar, the specific situations referenced in this sample were unique to the college classroom context. Importantly, those categories traditionally defined as Actor Responsible were translated here as additional Observer or Teacher Responsible embarrassment types. Moreover, this transfer from Student (Actor) to Teacher (Observer) responsibility or blame constituted the most frequently cited instances of embarrassment types for college students. Both Rule Violation (26%) and Threaten Image (22%) accounted for almost half of all classroom responses obtained. Furthermore, all but one category in interpersonal settings appeared in the college classroom. Even though the types of categories identified in this study were similar to Cupach and Metts' (1990a) scheme, many differences were found in the frequencies and percentages obtained for those categories.

Face Saving Strategies

The next research question addressed the extent to which the Cupach and Metts' (1990a) face saving typology generalize to teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom context. Students were asked what they said or did first to reduce their embarrassment. Students were also asked what they did second. As a result, two strategies were coded for each student (Total strategies cited = 416). Table 3 provides the resulting typology of face saving strategies with definitions and examples. Table 4 shows the resulting frequencies and percentages of both responses of face saving strategies (two responses per student) coded together. Table 4 also references the frequencies

and percentages of student responses coded separately (students' initial strategy / students' subsequent strategy).

Insert Tables 3 & 4 about here

Cupach and Metts' (1990a) original typology used Apology Plus and Remediation Plus to include all instances in which respondents report using Apology or Remediation along with any of the other strategies. Here, Apology Plus and Remediation Plus were not needed because students indicated two different responses to the embarrassment: their first response and second response. Students in the college classroom reported using the remaining seven original categories (Apologies, Accounts, Humor, Remediation, Avoidance, Escape, Aggression) along with two new categories (Defense, and Social Support).

Although the same categories emerged in the college classroom, clearly the majority of respondents reported using Avoidance tactics across both their first and second attempts to save face (N=223, 54%; see Table 4). Over 50% of all students cited silence, changing the topic, or some other form of Avoidance tactic in their efforts to cope with the embarrassing situation. Remediation was the second largest face saving strategy in the classroom (n=60, 15%). Remediation is designed to correct the predicament - - including actual compliance with the teacher. The remaining eight categories all fell below 8% of the total student responses: Apologies (n = 8, 2%), Accounts (n = 23, 6%; Excuses n = 8, 2% and Justification n=15, 4%), Humor (n=19, 5%), Escape (n =11, 3%), Aggression (n = 8, 2%), Defense (n = 18, 4%), Social Support (n = 16, 4%) and Miscellaneous/No Response (n = 30, 7%). Taken together, these remaining eight categories constitute 33% of the total strategies obtained.

In contrast, Cupach and Metts' (1990a) found Humor to be the most frequently occurring strategy cited in the interpersonal arena followed closely by Avoidance. Both Humor and Avoidance in Cupach and Metts' (1990a) investigation comprised 40% of all responses. Similarly, Apology only accounted for 2% of the responses in the classroom but accounted for 15% in Cupach and Metts' (1990a) investigation. In the present study, Humor and Apology together constituted less than 7% of the total responses.

On the other hand, Avoidance was a frequently occurring face saving strategy in both the interpersonal and college classroom contexts (the second largest category in the original typology [19%] and the largest category in the classroom typology [54%]). Likewise, Remediation accounted for approximately 12% of the responses in Cupach and Metts' study and 15% of the responses in the present study.

Discrepancies between the two contexts appear in the frequency of the strategies reportedly used. In the original typology, the types of face saving strategies used by respondents in social situations were more evenly distributed than in the college classroom. Here, students used Avoidance and Remediation almost exclusively to cope with teacher-initiated embarrassment. Almost 70% of all face saving strategies referenced were categorized as either Avoidance (54%) or Remediation (15%).

A comparison of students' first attempts to save face with students' second attempts (Table 4) is essential in understanding how students use face saving strategies in the college classroom. Results indicate that the types and frequencies of face saving strategies students reported using first are similar to those face saving strategies students reported using second. For instance, in both cases, Avoidance was the most frequently reported face saving strategy (53% for the first response, and 54% for the second response). The combined

frequency for Avoidance was 54% of the total reported responses. Additionally, Remediation was the second largest reported category in both cases (17% of the first response and 12% of the second response). Subsequent comparisons revealed a difference of only 6% or less between students' first and second responses.

Goals of embarrassment

In addition to identifying types of embarrassment and face saving strategies, the third research question asked students why they think their teacher embarrassed them. Students' responses were coded using Sharkey's (1991) typology of embarrassment goals. Table 5 provides the resulting typology of teacher-goals with definitions and examples. Table 6 shows the resulting frequencies and percentages of students' perceptions of teacher goals.

Insert Tables 5 & 6 about here

In Sharkey's (1991) study, respondents reported five primary goals people attempt to achieve through the use of intentional embarrassment in social situations: 1) Solidarity , 2) Negative Sanctioning (Gain Compliance), 3) Discredit, 4) Establish Power, and 5) Self-Satisfaction (Teacher Enjoyment). With some revision, these same five categories also emerged in this study. Moreover, four additional categories emerged: 6) Teacher Trait, 7) Reason Unknown, 8) Unintentional, and 9) Miscellaneous.

From the original five categories, two were slightly modified for the college classroom context. Negative Sanctioning was renamed Gain Compliance in an effort to better represent the meaning of the goal for the college classroom setting. Students reported teachers using this technique to

punish or criticize in an effort to correct or modify students' behavior. In this way, teachers used negative sanctioning to Gain Compliance or manage students' behavior. Similarly, Self-Satisfaction was renamed Teacher Enjoyment. Again, Teacher Enjoyment better represents the meaning of the goal for the college classroom. Teacher Enjoyment clearly indicated that the teacher embarrasses students for her/his own pleasure. One student wrote: "Sometimes the student is wrong but he (the teacher) seems to enjoy the attention."

An examination of the frequencies obtained reveal substantial differences from Sharkey's (1991) findings. Specifically, Solidarity was the most frequently reported goal in Sharkey's (1991) investigation comprising almost half (47%) of all responses in social situations. In the college classroom however, (Classroom) Solidarity accounted for only 5% (n = 11) of the responses. Furthermore, Discredit accounted for 18% of the responses in the previous study, but only 5% (n = 11) in this study.

While the differences in frequencies between these categories are highly disparate, the comparative frequencies among the remaining three categories are similar. Negative Sanctioning, renamed Gain Compliance in the present study, comprised 22% of the responses in Sharkey's (1991) study and 29% (n = 60) in this study. Although there is a 7% difference across the two studies, this category was the second most frequently reported goal in Sharkey's (1991) study and the most frequently reported goal in the present study. In other words, the rank order of this category is similar.

Moreover, the last two overlapping categories (Establish Power and Teacher Enjoyment) reveals 3% or less difference across the two studies. In Sharkey's (1991) study, 9% of the respondents reported Establish Power as a goal of embarrassment in this study; 6% (n = 12) of the students reported it as

a goal. Additionally 4% reported Self-Satisfaction in Sharkey's (1991) study; 4% (n = 8) of the students reported this as a goal (renamed Teacher Enjoyment).

Four goals, in addition to Sharkey's original five, were obtained in the classroom situation. First, Teacher Disposition (n = 28), comprising 13% of the responses, occurs when students attribute their embarrassment to the teacher's disposition or personality. Students indicated that some teachers, by nature, just tend to embarrass students. Second, some students did not know why their teacher embarrassed them. However, Reason Unknown only accounted for 3% (n = 6) of the responses. Surprisingly, the third new category, Unintentional, was the second largest goal type reported (24%, n = 48). The students did not think that their teacher set out to intentionally embarrass them (the teacher did not mean to embarrass the student). The last category, Miscellaneous, accounted for 11% of the responses (n = 23). Responses were coded into the miscellaneous category if the survey was left blank or the student did not answer the question asked. Some students seemed to misinterpret the question "Why do you think your teacher embarrassed you?" to read "Why were you embarrassed?"

Sharkey's (1991) categories of embarrassment goals did generalize to the college classroom. Some differences occurred in the frequency of responses. Not surprisingly the Unintentional category was represented in this investigation. In Sharkey's study, respondents were asked to describe a situation in their life when they intentionally embarrassed someone. In contrast, the present study asked students to describe a situation where they were embarrassed by their teacher. Clearly, since one can initiate embarrassment without intending embarrassment, the category Unintentional is likely to occur here.

Discussion

The general purpose of this study was to investigate teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom. Although researchers have investigated classifications of embarrassment in interpersonal and organizational contexts, no research examines these categories in the classroom setting. Specifically, the focus of this study was to assess the utility of three classification schemes of embarrassment in the classroom environment. Types of embarrassment, face saving strategies, and perceived goals of embarrassment were all reliably coded using the existing categories.

Types of Embarrassment. The first purpose of this study was to assess the generalizability of Cupach and Metts' (1990a) typology of embarrassing situations to teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom context. The results supported and extended Cupach and Metts' (1990a) typology. The categories used by Cupach and Metts (1990a) did generalize to the college classroom; however, the rank-ordered frequencies of the categories differed somewhat.

In both contexts, embarrassment occurred most frequently under the Actor (Student) Responsible Categories. Cupach and Metts (1990a) found Comportment to be the largest category in the interpersonal environment, but instead, Rule Violation was the most frequently occurring situation in the classroom environment. Comportment was not found as a type of embarrassment that occurs in the college classroom environment.

The emphasis on following rules in the classroom may explain the overwhelming frequency of Rule Violation in the college classroom. In most primary and secondary schools, the violation of these classroom rules are generally not tolerated. Because the college environment is seen as more

flexible than primary and secondary schools, students may test this flexibility by violating rules. For instance, if a student is late for class in high school, the tardiness is generally reported to the student's parents. In college, these rule violations often go unnoticed. Therefore, many students may not be as motivated to follow these rules.

The reported frequency of Individualization (recognition/praise, criticism/correction, and teasing/sarcasm) was also disparate across the two contexts. Cupach and Metts' (1990a) respondents reported 13% of embarrassing situations due to Individualization. In contrast, 30% reported embarrassment due to Individualization in the college classroom. The classroom setting is defined as an evaluative environment. In particular, Praise/Recognition and Criticism/Correction are expected in the classroom. Although a student may expect to be evaluated in the classroom, the student's image is still exposed. If this image is not congruent with how the student wishes to be seen, embarrassment may occur.

The remainder of the frequencies in this study were fairly consistent with Cupach and Metts' (1990a) frequencies. However, a notable difference between the two contexts is the crossover between Actor Responsible and Observer Responsible categories in the college classroom. For example, even though a student violated a rule, the student attributed responsibility of the embarrassment to the teacher. The embarrassment from the rule violation did not occur from the student being late, for instance, but from the teacher calling attention to the rule violation.

Goals of Embarrassment. The second purpose of this study was to assess the utility of Sharkey's (1991) typology of goals of embarrassment in the college classroom. In Sharkey's (1991) study respondents most frequently reported Solidarity as the goal for embarrassment. In fact, almost half of the

respondents (47%) reported Solidarity a goal. In contrast, students in this study reported only 5% of the teachers' goals as Solidarity. Instead, students primarily indicated that teachers embarrass students to Gain Compliance (29%). Still, many students believed the embarrassment was Unintentional (24%), while others indicated that teachers embarrass students as part of their personality or disposition (13%). The remainder of the categories, not including Miscellaneous, all fell below 7%.

Again, the perceived goal of Gain Compliance may be a function of the type of embarrassment. For example, if a teacher embarrasses a student for being late to class (Rule Violation), then the student may see the teacher as trying to encourage her/him to follow rules or comply with the teacher. Interestingly, almost one-third of students' responses indicated that students perceive that either teachers unintentionally embarrass students or that teachers embarrass students as part of their teachers' personality. Both of these goals (Unintentional and Teacher Disposition) emerged in the instructional context; these goals were not found in either the organizational or interpersonal context.

Face Saving Strategies. The third purpose of this study was to assess the utility of Cupach and Metts' (1990a) face saving typology in teacher-initiated embarrassment in the college classroom. Again, although all the categories from the original typology were found in the college setting, the ranked frequencies of occurrence differed. In Cupach and Metts' (1990a) investigation, Humor (approximately 21%) and Avoidance (approximately 19%) were the two most frequently reported strategies. Next, Apology (approximately 14%) and Remediation (approximately 13%) were the third and fourth most frequently reported categories. The remainder of the original frequencies were relatively small.

In contrast, students in the college classroom setting reported using Avoidance almost exclusively (54%). Although Avoidance was the second most frequently reported face saving strategy in the interpersonal context, there is a 35% difference in this category across the two contexts. Furthermore, Avoidance was the most frequently occurring strategy for students' first and second responses. Remediation was reported with almost equal frequency across the two contexts (13% for the interpersonal context and 15% for the college classroom context). The frequency of the remaining strategies used by students in the classroom all fell below 8%.

This overwhelming reliance on Avoidance as a face saving strategy used by students may be a function of the type of embarrassment. In other words, because Rule Violation is reportedly the most frequently occurring type of embarrassment, Avoidance may be the most likely coping strategy. Students who are guilty of violating a classroom rule may try not to augment the embarrassment by saying anything to the teacher. In this way the student is implicitly accepting blame for the violation. Because the student has obviously violated a classroom rule, accepting the blame might be the most socially appropriate way to deal with that type of embarrassment.

Implications for Teachers. Based on these results, we can conclude that embarrassment in the college classroom differs somewhat from other contexts. There are several implications of this research for the college teacher. First, teachers should remember that their intentions to reward students with recognition and praise may actually cause the student embarrassment. This embarrassment may defeat the purpose of the praise by making the student feel self conscious instead of proud. However, not all embarrassment is necessarily negative. Whether or not students feel embarrassment from the recognition may be dependent upon each particular

student. Therefore, teachers should use caution when praising students. Perhaps private recognition may be better in some cases than public recognition.

The second largest type of embarrassment reported by students was Threaten Image. The majority of this category is composed of three subcategories: Accusation, Labels, and Discount ideas. Teachers should be cautious when accusing students of wrong doing. Again, instead of accusing students in front of her/his peers, teachers may talk privately with the student. This way their reputation with the entire class is not threatened; the student may feel more comfortable and less defensive.

Labeling and discounting students' ideas also threatens students' images. This can be avoided if teachers are aware of stereotyping students. Teachers should realize that all students of a particular group are not the same. For instance, one sorority student was embarrassed when her teacher put down all sorority girls. In addition, teachers should listen to students ideas. Students indicated that embarrassment arose when teachers put down their ideas.

Based on the face saving strategies reported, embarrassment may be an effective strategy to gain students' compliance. Almost 70% of all the face saving strategies reported by students were either avoidance or remediation. For the most part then, students tried to save face by obeying rules. For example, some students indicated that after the teacher embarrassed them, they were not late to class again. Similarly, almost 30% of the students perceived their teachers' goals of embarrassment as Gain Compliance / Classroom Management.

Directions for Future Research. Research is under way which examines students' perceptions of teachers who use embarrassment. The

research will investigate students' affect toward teachers who embarrass them, the degree of embarrassment students' feel, perceived effectiveness of students' face saving attempts, and students' attributions of their teachers' use of embarrassment. Continued research on classroom embarrassment will provide a greater understanding of students' experiences with embarrassment in the classroom environment.

References

Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1990a, November). The effects of type of predicament and embarrassability on remedial responses to embarrassing situations. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Cupach, W. R., & Metts, S. (1990b). Remedial processes in embarrassing predicaments. Communication Yearbook, 13, 323-352.

Cupach, W.R., Metts, S., & Hazleton, V. Jr. (1986). Coping with embarrassing predicaments: Remedial strategies and their perceived utility. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5, 181-200.

Edelmann, R. J. (1985). Social Embarrassment: An analysis of the process. Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2, 195-213.

Edelmann, R. J. (1987). The psychology of embarrassment. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Hays, E., & Ivey, M. (1991). College teacher misbehaviors: What student s don't like about what teachers say and do. Communication Quarterly, 39, 309-324.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1985). Power in the classroom III: Teacher communication techniques and messages. Communication Education, 34, 19-28.

Kearney, P., Plax, T. G., Sorensen, G., & Smith, V. (1988). Experienced and prospective teachers' selection of compliance-gaining messages for "common" student misbehaviors. Communication Education, 37, 150-164.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work. Psychiatry, 18, 213-231.

Goffman, E. (1956). Embarrassment and social organization. The American Journal of Sociology, 62, 264-271.

Goffman, E. (1967). Interaction ritual. Chicago, Il: Aldine Publishing Company.

Goffman, E. (1971). Relations in public. New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers.

Gross, E. & Stone, G. P. (1964). Embarrassment and the analysis of role requirement. The American Journal of Sociology, 70, 1-15.

Martin, W. B. W. (1987). Students' perceptions of causes and consequences of embarrassment in the school. Canadian Journal of Education, 12, 277-293.

Metts, S., & Cupach, W. R. (1989). Situational influence on the use of remedial strategies in embarrassing predicaments. Communication Monographs, 56, 151-162.

Modigliani, A. (1968). Embarrassment and embarrassability. Sociometry, 31, 313-326.

Modigliani, A. (1971). Embarrassment, facework, and eye contact: Testing a theory of embarrassment. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 17, 15-24.

Petronio, S., & Snider, E. (1990, November). Planned strategic embarrassment. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Sattler, J. M. (1965). A theoretical, developmental, and clinical investigation of embarrassment. Genetic Psychology Monographs, 71, 19-59.

Sharkey, W. F. (1991, February). Intentional Embarrassment: Goals, Tactics, and Consequences, Paper presented at the Western States Communication Association, Phoenix, AZ.

Sharkey, W. F., & Stafford, L. (1990). Responses to embarrassment. Human Communication Research, 17, 315-342.

Sharkey, W. R., & Waldron, V. R. (1990, November). The intentional embarrassment of subordinates in the workplace. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association convention, Chicago, IL.

Weinberg, M. S. (1968). Embarrassment: Its variable and invariable aspects. Social Forces, 46, 382-388.

Table 1

Types of Embarrassing Situations: Revised Typology and Representative Examples

Type	Description /Examples
1. Teacher Recognition/Praise	Embarrassment occurs when attention is drawn to the student through praise or recognition of the presence.
A. Praise	Students are embarrassed by being praised for good work in front of others. Examples: "The teacher read my midterm exam (essay) to the class, saying how good it was." "Every time there is a quiz or exam, the professor calls out the students' names who got A's and he makes them stand up in front of the class. His intentions were good, but I would have preferred if he complimented me in person rather than in front of the class."
B. Physical Recognition	Students are embarrassed by a teacher noticing students' physical appearances. Examples: "I asked for help, and all the teacher said was you shouldn't wear stripes going horizontal on your chest. It makes them look bigger." "I was sitting in class (a lecture hall) taking notes. My teacher was giving a lecture when all of a sudden the teacher stopped and looked at me and said, 'Hey, you got a haircut. I like it.' I just kind of sunk in my seat while the whole class turned to look at me."
C. Solicit Involvement	Students are embarrassed when chosen to participate in some way. Examples: "The teacher called on me to express my opinion on a subject in front of the class." "The teacher asked for volunteers for an experiment. No one volunteered, so the teacher chose me."
2. Teasing/Sarcasm	Embarrassment results from teachers teasing students or from teachers using sarcasm directly relating to the students' actions.
A. Teasing	The teacher jokes with, or makes fun of Student. Examples:

"In a P.E. class, the teacher said that he might put a leash on me to keep me from wandering and doing something stupid."

"I accidently walked into my acting class in the middle of a scene and my teacher jokingly began booing me."

B. Sarcasm

The teacher uses cutting remarks toward the student. Examples:

"We were practicing artificial breathing and the dummy that I was using didn't seem to be working right. When I asked for help, the teacher said something to the effect, 'If you take your tongue out of her mouth and stop frenching her, maybe it would work better.'"

"The teacher asked if anyone had any questions about the test. I asked a question that was too broad, I guess. So the teacher said 'Why don't I review the whole book'."

3. Teacher Correction/Criticism

Teacher embarrass student either by correcting the student or by criticizing students' work in front of her/his peers.

A. Correction

Teacher corrects student while the student is performing a task. Examples:

"I was in my aerobics class and the instructor pointed me out and tried to help me because I got lost."

"I was doing a monologue about my father dying. My teacher started screaming at me to put more feeling into the monologue. I must have done it 20 times in front of the class."

B. Public Criticism

Teacher publicly critiques Students' finished work. Examples:

"In an art class, on one of the first days, we were instructed to display our drawings for the class and teacher to critique. I drew a picture of my girlfriend and myself. It was an embarrassing situation to have it critiqued."

"I turned in a final project for the first time (before final review) and my teacher held it up as the completely wrong way to do it."

"As I was reading my paper in front of the class, the teacher began to criticize it and had students give me suggestions."

4. Cause to Look Unpoised

The student feels and/or looks awkward because of the teacher's action or the student's own actions. Examples:

"I was dressed up as a flasher for an acting class and I walked into the wrong class because I was so nervous."

"I volunteered for an interview and the teacher held my hand and led me to a seat."

5. Association

The student is associated with another causing a disruption. Example:

"Some students were talking in front of me in a large lecture hall. When the teacher stopped his lecture and told the students to be quiet, the entire lecture hall turned around and looked right at me as though I was the one talking."

6. Empathic

The student feels embarrassed for another person. Example:

"I was embarrassed when the teacher stopped a student in the middle of the speech and humiliated and embarrassed him in front of everyone."

7. Privacy Violation

The teacher reveals personal information about a student that the student does not wish revealed. Example:

"The teacher asked if there was anyone in class who is married, but I did not raise my hand because I'm the only one in class who's married. He knows that I am married and said 'Aren't you married, why don't you answer some of our questions.'"

8. Rule Violation

Student violates rules of the classroom, however, the embarrassment occurs as a result of the teacher drawing attention to the violation not the violation itself.

A. Tardiness

Student is late for class. Example:

"I was late to class and when I walked in the teacher stopped class and stared me down."

"Whenever I am a little late to class the teacher makes a spectacle out of me and the class laughs at me."

B. Talking

Student is talking during class. Examples:

"I was talking in the back of the classroom and the teacher got really annoyed. In front of the whole class, the teacher asked us if we wanted to conduct the class. Then he said that he wanted us to come up in front of the class and tell everyone what we were talking about."

"I was talking in the back of the room and the professor stopped the lecture and told me to move."

C. Inattentiveness

Student does not pay attention to the lecture. Examples:

"One of my professors was going over the homework and I fell asleep. When the professor called on me I was surprised and couldn't answer the question."

"I was sitting in class and the instructor called on me while I was daydreaming."

D. Miscellaneous and Idiosyncratic Rules

Miscellaneous rules and rules that are specific to a particular class. Examples:

"One day I had a drink during class with ice in it and the ice made some noise, so my teacher said, 'Who has ice, who was making that noise, you know ice irritates me!' He kept going on and on about it. Then he told me not to do that ever again."

"I was turning my test into the teacher when I was finished and I threw it into the box with the other tests. There was a huge line of people behind me and he stopped me and asked me not to mess the box up and made me stand there until everyone else had put their tests into the box in an orderly manner."

9. Threaten Image

The student is embarrassed when the teacher presents an image of the student that is inconsistent with how the student wishes to be viewed.

A. Accusation

The teacher accuses the student of a wrong-doing. Examples:

"I raised my hand and asked a question regarding the teacher's lecture. The teacher replied, 'Well, if you would read your text...' The entire class laughed."

"A teacher accused me of cheating during my mid-term exam. I was not cheating but the teacher told me to get out of the class immediately."

B. Labels

The teacher calls the student by an unflattering name or associates the student with a stereotype. Example:

"The teacher said something I agreed with so I raised my hand and said 'I agree.' I was just being a smart ass. The teacher looked at me and said, 'Somebody get this man a Kleenex so he can wipe off his nose' (insinuating that I was brown-nosing). The class laughed and I shut up."

"My professor put down sorority girls and the Greek system. At that time, I had just gotten into a house and was pledging, and I was still insecure about everything."

C. Inadequacy

Teacher makes student feel dumb for asking a question. Examples:

" My teacher said in front of the class that I didn't belong in this class due to the question I asked that he regarded as stupid."

"I asked my teacher if the test tubes have to be washed. He replied 'Can't you read that sign over there?' I felt stupid and all my friends were staring at me."

D. Discount Ideas	The teacher discounts or "shoots down" students' opinions, perceptions, and/or feelings. Examples: "The teacher seemed to condemn me and discount my feelings and perception in the way he responded to my statement. It embarrassed me and angered me." "In my class our teacher would say 'Hey, can't you solve this EASY problem? God, did you really graduate from high school?"
E. Negative Recognition	Teacher reveals negative information to the entire class about a student's performance (i.e. bad grade). Examples: "Before the teacher returned our papers, he wrote a couple names of students on the board that he needed to talk to regarding the paper, and my name was first." "My teacher was returning our first exam results, and loudly said, 'Well, you need to come to my office because it looks like you need a lot of help.'"
10. Abilities/Skills	Student can not answer or incorrectly responds to teacher's questions. Examples: "I was selected to use a machine in front of the class. I didn't know how and the teacher let me sweat it out step by step." "I was asked to translate a sentence in Chinese, but I didn't really know how."
11. Responsibilities/ Obligations	Student is unprepared. The student did not do assignment/reading. Examples: "I didn't do my homework the night before and the teacher called on me in class to give my answers to the homework." " The teacher called on me to answer a question on the material I was supposed to read but had not read."
12. Miscellaneous	Students are embarrassed by anomalous classroom events. For instance, the topic of class discussion embarrasses the student. Example: "The teacher said vulgar things to the class about males and females."

Table 2

Frequency and Percentage of Embarrassing Situations

Type	Frequency	%
1. Recognition/Praise	**25**	**12%**
A. Praise	(11)	(5%)
B. Physical Recognition	(4)	(2%)
C. Solicit Involvement	(10)	(5%)
2. Teasing/Sarcasm	**19**	**9%**
A. Teasing	(10)	(5%)
B. Sarcasm	(9)	(4%)
3. Correction/Criticism	**18**	**9%**
A. Correction	(6)	(3%)
B. Public Criticism	(12)	(6%)
4. Cause to Look Unpoised	**7**	**3%**
5. Association	**2**	**1%**
6. Empathic	**3**	**1%**
7. Privacy Violation	**1**	**.5%**
8. Rule Violation	**55**	**26%**
A. Tardiness	(14)	(7%)
B. Talking	(18)	(9%)
C. Inattentiveness	(13)	(6%)
D. Miscellaneous & Idiosyncratic Rules	(10)	(5%)
9. Threaten Image	**46**	**22%**
A. Accusation	(12)	(6%)
B. Labels	(11)	(5%)
C. Inadequacy	(6)	(3%)
D. Discount ideas	(12)	(6%)
E. Negative recognition	(5)	(2%)
10. Abilities/Skills	**18**	**9%**
11. Responsibilities/Obligations	**7**	**3%**
12. Miscellaneous	**7**	**3%**
TOTAL	**208**	**98.5%**

Table 3

Types of Face Saving Strategies: Revised Typology and Representative Examples

Type	Description /Examples
1. Apologies	Apologies are statements used to accept blame and seek amends for untoward behavior. Apologies range from simple statements such as "I'm sorry," to more complicated expressions of regret or remorse. Examples: "I apologized for being so rude." "I apologized for doing so well."
2. Accounts	Accounts are verbal statements that explain inappropriate or awkward behavior by providing either "excuses" or "justification."
A. Excuses	Excuses include statements that attempt to redefine an event by minimizing the actor's responsibility for the inappropriate act. Examples: "I told (the teacher) that he didn't give us/me enough explanation to help us solve the problem."
B. Justification	Justifications are used to redefine the transgression by down-playing the harmful consequences of the act. Examples: "I told him that I have a class before his that is far away." "I just didn't understand the explanation."
3. Humor	Humor allows an embarrassed person to cope with the embarrassment by implicitly acknowledging the blame. Humor releases tension to overcome the lapse in social competence with a display of social competence. Examples: "I played along with it (the teacher's joke)." "I made a joke."
4. Remediation	This includes direct attempts to correct the predicament. This strategy attempts to fix the failed presentation of self or comply with a request. Remediation would include any instance of cleaning up spills or compliance. Examples: "I tried to do what she (the teacher) said." "I cleaned up the mess while the teacher continued to make an example out of me." "I stopped talking."

5. Avoidance

Avoidance refers to a variety of tactics which enable an offending actor to elude explanations for a behavior. Avoidance tactics may include denial that the event has occurred, changing the topic, or silence. Examples:

"I said nothing."

"I looked down to avoid eye contact with the teacher."

6. Escape

This is an extreme form of avoidance in which an embarrassed individual physically retreats from the encounter. Examples:

"I walked out of the class."

"I dropped the class."

7. Aggression

Aggression is physically, verbally or nonverbally attacking another person present. In this way, embarrassment is redefined as anger. Examples:

"I glared at the teacher."

"I gave her awful stares and said callous things when she was within an earshot."

8. Defense

Defense consists of strategies in which the student defends his/her position or argues with the teacher. Examples:

"I talked back."

"I told him I could get proof (for my answer)."

9. Social Support

Social support refers to tactics a student uses to gain support from her/his peers, parents, or friends. Examples:

"I called him a jerk to the person next to me."

"I talked to some friends about the situation and made bad remarks about the teacher's personality."

"I made fun of the teacher with my classmates."

10. Miscellaneous

Miscellaneous encompasses responses that were anomalous in nature or that were left blank.

Table 4

Frequency and Percentage of Face Saving Strategies

Type	Combined Frequency	%	First Strategy Frequency	%	Second Strategy Frequency	%
1. Apologies	8	2%	5	2%	3	1%
2. Accounts	23	6%	16	7%	7	3%
A. Excuses	(8)	(2%)	(5)	(2%)	(3)	(1%)
B. Justification	(15)	(4%)	(11)	(5%)	(4)	(2%)
3. Humor	19	5%	12	6%	7	3%
4. Remediation	60	15%	36	17%	24	12%
5. Avoidance	223	54%	110	53%	113	54%
6. Escape	11	3%	1	0.5	10	5%
7. Aggression	8	2%	2	1%	6	3%
8. Defense	18	4%	11	5%	7	3%
9. Social Support	16	4%	6	3%	10	5%
10. Miscellaneous	30	7%	9	4%	21	10%
Total	416*	102%	208	98.5%	208	99%

*Students were asked to "describe as specifically as possible what you said or did (if anything) to try to cope with this embarrassing situation." They were asked to indicate what they did first to reduce their embarrassment and what they did second.

Table 5

Goals of Embarrassment: Revised Typology and Representative Examples

Type	Description /Examples
1. Classroom Solidarity	Teachers show solidarity by complimenting students, acknowledging good work, to show liking towards a student, to show group or class solidarity, for fun (teasing), to make a time memorable, to be the center of attention, to make a person feel important, to honor a person, or to be (themselves) one of the crowd. Examples: "It was meant all in good fun." "He liked me." "He embarrassed me because we are friends and he knows that I wouldn't mind if it is in fun."
2. Gain Compliance	Here, teachers use embarrassment as a classroom management technique. Teachers use negative sanctioning to get students to follow rules or to correct/modify a behavior. Teachers may punish a student as an example or teach a lesson to the rest of the class. Students also feel teachers punish them in the students' best interest. Examples: "He embarrassed me to stop me from being late again." "The teacher embarrassed me to set an example. I guess it worked because nobody talks in class anymore." "She embarrassed me so that I could learn from my mistake and correct the problem." "The teacher only meant to help but he did it in an insensitive way."
3. Establish Power	Students view teachers as showing superiority, authority, or trying to gain the upperhand. Examples: "He felt he was God of the classroom. He didn't like people to move or make any noise. The man was psycho." "He embarrassed my to show that he was more of an authority figure." "He liked to prove how tough and superior he was."

4. Discredit

Teachers may discredit students to get revenge, puncture false fronts, or retaliate. Examples:

"The teacher embarrassed me because I'm a wise-guy."

"I suppose she thought I wasn't being honest in my statements."

5. Teacher Enjoyment

Teachers may embarrass students just because it's funny, for self enjoyment, or just to see a reaction. Examples:

"Personally, I think he enjoys it. He puts people down then laughs about it."

"He probably just wanted to have a few laughs. He probably wanted to play with my mind as well."

6. Teacher Trait

Students attribute the embarrassment to some type of teacher trait or personality. The teacher may embarrass students often in class. Students may assume that either the teacher just has a negative personality or is in a bad mood. Examples:

"He seems to be extremely negative all the time."

"She was in a bad mood already and was taking it out on her students."

"I think he had an attitude problem. He seemed arrogant from the way he acted and treated the students."

"He is very closed and rigid. He is also aloof and insensitive to his students as a whole."

7. Reason Unknown

Some student don't know why their teacher embarrassed them. Example:

"I wish I knew."

"I really don't know."

8. Unintentional

Many times students don't believe their teacher meant to embarrass them. Examples:

"She probably didn't realize that she embarrassed me."

"I don't think he was aiming to embarrass me, it just turned out that way."

9. Miscellaneous

Responses were labeled miscellaneous if left blank or if students did not seem to understand the question.

Table 6

Frequency and Percentage of Student-perceived Teacher Goals

Type	Frequency	%
1. Classroom Solidarity	11	5%
2. Gain Compliance / Classroom Management	60	29%
3. Establish Power	12	6%
4. Discredit (revenge/get even)	11	5%
5. Teacher Enjoyment	8	4%
6. Teacher Disposition	28	13%
7. Reason Unknown	6	3%
8. Unintentional	48	24%
9. Miscellaneous / Blank	23	11%
Total	208	100%